## **EXHIBIT P**

```
645
 1
          IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
        FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA
 2
     IN RE: PROCESSED EGG PRODUCTS :
 3
     ANTITRUST LITIGATION
      ----: MDL No. 2002
 4
     THIS DOCUMENT APPLIES TO: : 08-MD-02002
 5
     ALL ACTIONS
 6
 7
               -- HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL --
 8
                Thursday, June 27, 2013
 9
10
                Continued videotaped deposition of
11
12
     GENE W. GREGORY, taken at the offices of
13
     Pepper Hamilton LLP, 3000 Two Logan Square,
     18th & Arch Street, Philadelphia,
14
15
     Pennsylvania 19103, beginning at 8:08 a.m.,
     before LINDA ROSSI RIOS, RPR, CCR and Notary
16
     Public.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

```
852
 1
         GENE W. GREGORY - HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
 2
             symposium type thing for Kroger, and I
 3
             know Kroger has always been a
 4
             supporter of the program.
      BY MS. LEVINE:
 5
 6
             Ο.
                   Did retailers support the UEP
 7
      certified program?
                    MR. OLSON: Objection to form.
 8
                    THE WITNESS: Yes. Otherwise
 9
10
             the program would have never been a
11
             success.
12
      BY MS. LEVINE:
13
             Q. Can you take out Gregory-103
14
      that was just shown to you today by
15
      plaintiff's counsel? I think it's probably
      on -- going to be on the bottom.
16
            A. See I've got it all mixed up
17
          103.
18
      now.
19
             Q. 103. Maybe the court reporter
20
      can help you out. I think the court reporter
21
      is going to help you out.
22
                   Just that September 2000 --
23
      sorry about this. I got them all mixed up
24
      now. 103, yes.
25
                    MR. OLSON: Sorry, could you
```

```
857
 1
          GENE W. GREGORY - HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL
 2
             Voices. Right?
 3
                    THE WITNESS: Yes.
                    MS. LEVINE: Yes, March 25,
 4
             2002, United Voices.
 5
 6
      BY MS. LEVINE:
 7
                    Why did UEP think it was
             Ο.
 8
      important for producers to implement the
      guidelines even if their customers were not
 9
10
      yet demanding the guidelines?
                    MR. OLSON: Objection to form.
11
12
                    THE WITNESS: In our view, we
13
             felt that it was important for our
14
             industry finally to have a program
15
             already in place that addressed animal
             welfare issues. And so when a
16
17
             customer was now being targeted by
             animal activists, they knew where to
18
19
             turn to for help and to, you know,
20
             change, you know, their specifications
21
             for buying.
22
                    So it was not -- it was not
23
             necessarily done for the retailer, but
24
             we needed retailer support. We needed
25
             retailer's input into this. But we
```